

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 IAEA V 09489 01 OF 02 160136Z

62

ACTION IO-13

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDA-07 CIAE-00 INR-07 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 NRC-05 OES-06 DODE-00 FEA-01

OIC-02 AF-08 ARA-06 EA-07 NEA-10 USIE-00 PRS-01

NSCE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 /101 W  
----- 112363

O R 152009Z NOV 76

FM USMISSION IAEA VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC NIACT IMMEDIATE 8379

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USUN NEW YORK 3751

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USERDA HQ WASHDC

USERDA HQ GERMANTOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 IAEA VIENNA 9489

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (ADDITION OF MOSCOW AS INFO ADDEE)

DEPT PASS IO/SCT AND ACDA FOR MALONE, DAIVES

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, TECH, IAEA

SUBJECT: IAEA AD HOC ADVISORY GROUP ON PNES: RESPONSE TO USG REQUEST  
FOR INFORMATION

REF: (A) STATE 280046, (B) IAEA VIENNA 9316, (C) STATE 273934,  
(D) IAEA VIENNA 9378, (E) IAEA VIENNA 9270

1. SUMMARY: U.S. DEL TO SUBJECT GROUP MEETINGS PROVIDES  
ANSWERS TO DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR INFO RE VIEWS OTHER  
DELS AND GROUP PROCEDURES. END SUMMARY.

2. AS REQUESTED REFTEL A, ANSWERS BELOW PROVIDED IN  
CONFORMITY WITH INSTRUCTION PARA THIRTEEN REFTEL A:  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 IAEA V 09489 01 OF 02 160136Z

A. RE PARA (2) REFTEL A, CONSENSUS PRINCIPLE HAS BEEN

APPLIED BY AD HOC GROUP (AND WILSON, IN PARTICULAR) IN PRACTICE TO DATE IN FOLLOWING WAY: WHEN ON ONE MORE DELS EXPRESS DISSATISFACTION WITH PARTICULAR FORMULATION, SUGGESTIONS ARE MADE BY OTHER DELS FOR ALTERNATE LANGUAGE INTENDED TO ALLAY DISSATISFACTION. ON POINTS WHERE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES ARE KNOWN TO WILSON TO EXIST AMONG DELS, HE OFTEN PERSONALLY CONVENES INFORMAL WORKING PARTY IN EFFORT TO FIND FORMULATION WHICH WILL NOT PREJUDICE RESPECTIVE VIEWS. HE OFTEN, BASED UPON HIS LONG EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE OF SENSITIVITIES INVOLVED, WILL FLOAT FORMULATION INTENDED TO ACHIEVE "ACCEPTANCE" IN FORM OF "NO OBJECTION" BY DELS CONCERNED. HE WILL STRIVE HARD TO AVOID CONFRONTATION ON SPECIFIC ISSUES TO POINT OF OMITTING TOPIC ENTIRELY FROM DOCUMENT, WITH SUMMARY RECORD OF PLENARIES SHOWING DIFFERING VIEWS. HIS FIRST PRIORITY IS TO FIND NON-OBJECTIONABLE FORMULATIONS. IF TOPIC CANNOT BE OMITTED, PRESUMABLY (CASE HAS YET TO ARISE) ONE OR MORE DELS MAY STATE RESERVATION ON FORMULATION, WHICH WOULD LIKELY PROVOKE REMINDER BY WILSON THAT ENTIRE DOCUMENT IS AD REFERENDUM. THUS, ANSWER TO QUESTION 2(A) IS NEGATIVE ASSUMING QUESTION RELATES TO DRAFT DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY AD HOC GROUP INTENDED TO BE AD REFERENDUM TO GOVERNMENTS.

2. RESPONSE TO QUESTION PARA 2B REFTEL A:

NEGATIVE. UNDERSTAND THAT GROUP'S WORK WOULD PROCEED ON BASIS OF CONSENSUS WAS FIRST ENUNCIATED ON RECORD OF GROUP'S SECOND MEETING, OCTOBER 2, 1975 (SEE IAEA DOC. GOV/COM.23/OR.2, PARA FIVE, AND ALSO IAEA DOC. GOV/OR.480, PARA SIXTY-FIVE FOR EVIDENCE THAT THIS UNDERSTANDING SHARED IN BG WHEN GROUP ESTABLISHED);

C. RESPONSE TO QUESTION PARA 2C REFTEL A: AFFIRMATIVE, IS SO FAR AS KNOWN TO U.S. DEL. U.S. DEL NOTICES THAT FACT GROUP CAN PROCEED ONLY ON BASIS OF CONSENSUS HAS BEEN IMPLICIT IN ALL ITS INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS WITH OTHER DELS AS WELL AS ALL INTERVENTIONS IN PLENARY BY OTHER DELS THUS FAR. WITH REGARD TO PARAS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 IAEA V 09489 01 OF 02 160136Z

3B, 3D, 4C, AND 6 OF REFTEL B, U.S. DEL WISHES TO NOTE FOLLOWING POINTS: PARA 3B SHOULD HAVE CONTAINED WORKDS "SUGGESTION FOR" IN TEXT BETWEEN WORKDS "WIDELY-SUPPORTED" AND "STATEMENT" (U.S. DEL REGRETS ANY MISAPPREHENSION WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN OCCASIONED BY THIS OMISSION); PARA 3D DOES NOT, IN VIEW U.S. DEL, CONTAIN SUGGESTION NOTED REFTEL A; PARA 4C DOES NOT, IN VIEW U.S. DEL, SUGGEST ADOPTION OF ANY NON-

CONSENSUS VIEW SINCE PRINCIPLE REFERS ONLY TO, AND EXEMPLIFIES ONLY, DIFFERENT POSSIBLE APPROACHES, AS REPORTED, AND IS NOT MEANT TO CONVEY IMPRESSION THAT GROUP WOULD ITSELF SELECT PROCEDURE TO WHICH REFERENCE MADE. RATHER, DISCUSSION MADE CLEAR THAT IT IS THE PARTIES THEMSELVES TO ANY SUCH ARRANGEMENTS WHICH WILL RIGHTLY MAKE SELECTION OF PROCEDURE; PARA 52 SIMILARLY WAS NOT INTENDED TO, BY U.S. DEL (AND DOES NOT IN DEL'S OPINION), CONVEY SUGGESTION THAT PROCEDURAL RULES OF GROUP WOULD PROHIBIT OBJECTION DESCRIBED. RATHER, U.S. DEL INTENDED TO CONVEY INSURMOUNTABLE DIFFICULTIES OF A PRACTICAL NATURE WHICH WOULD FLOW FROM A U.S. DEL OBJECTION TO ANOTHER DEL'S READING A STATEMENT, BY THE U.S. GOVERNOR IN THE BG, INTO THE RECORD OR A DOCUMENT OF THE GROUP. SUCH A COURSE OF ACTION WOULD CAST DOUBT ON A STATEMENT OF USG POLICY WHICH IS STILL TIMELY AND VALID TO KNOWLEDGE OF U.S. DEL (AND RE WHICH U.S. DEL HAS SOUGHT INSTRUCTIONS PERMITTING ACCEPTANCE);

D. RESPONSE TO QUESTION PARA 2D REFTEL A: AS FAR AS IS KNOWN BY U.S. DEL, CHAIRMAN WILSON WOULD NOT PERMIT ADOPTION OF ANY SUBSTANTIVE POINT (AND PROBABLY NO OTHER POINT) OVER OBJECTION OF ANY DEL. NO SUCH RULING HAS AS YET BEEN REQUIRED;

E. RESPONSE TO QUESTION PARA 3A REFTEL A: DELS INDICATING INTEREST ARE UK, SWEDEN, EGYPT AND INDIA, AND APPARENTLY ALSO FRG AND AUSTRALIA. OPPOSED ARE USA AND JAPAN. UK DEL HAS PROPOSED FORMULATION PRIVATELY (TO U.S., EGYPT, INDIA AND FRG) WHICH WOULD PERMIT CHOICE BY NNWS PARTY TO ARRANGEMENTS TO CHOOSE SUPPLIER STATE PARTY TO ARRANGEMENTS, CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 IAEA V 09489 01 OF 02 160136Z

THEREBY PERMITTING INDIA TO BE SUPPLIER IF IT BECAME PARTY TO ARRANGEMENTS. SWEDISH DEL HAS INDICATED PRIVATELY THAT NPT CANNOT BE INTERPRETED TO PROHIBIT NNWS PARTY TO NPT FROM OBTAINING NUCLEAR EXPLOSION SERVICES FROM NON-PARTY SUPPLIER STATE. WE CANNOT JUDGE WHETHER UK DEL IS REFLECTING COMPLETELY THOUGHT-OUT POSITION, BUT ACCORDING TO SWEDISH DEL THIS IS CASE. WE ALSO NOTE THAT NUMBER OF GOVERNMENTS WERE NOT REPRESENTED THROUGHOUT SESSIONS LAST WEEK WHICH MIGHT FOLLOW EGYPTIAN LEAD ON THIS POINT (E.G., YUGOSLAVIA AND ROMANIA);

F. RESPONSE TO QUESTION EB, REFTEL A: ALL DISCUSSIONS THIS SUBJECT PRIVATE THUS FAR. REASON MOST OFTEN ADVANCED IS THAT NPT DOES NOT PROHIBIT THIS RESULT AND

THEREFORE ARTICLE FIVE OFFERS MEANS TO PREVENT FURTHER PROLIFERATION TO OTHER COUNTRIES BY INDIA VIA PNE ROUTE. ANOTHER POINT ADVANCED IS THAT NNWS OUGHT TO HAVE FREEDOM OF SUPPLIER CHOICE IN CASE NWS'S PARTY TO NPT DO NOT "REALIZE" PNE BENEFITS.

G. RESPONSE TO QUESTION 3C, REFTEL A: BASIC MOTIVATION OF UK AND SWEDEN (AND, ACCORDING TO SWEDISH DELOFF, VIEW EXPRESSED BY UK FCO (THOMPSON) WHEN GROUP SET UP) IS TO BRING INDIA INTO INTERNATIONAL PNE SERVICE REGIME TO STOP PROLIFERATION BY INDIA OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BEYOND ITS BORDERS TO NNWS. MOTIVATION OF THIRD WORLD, AS EXPLAINED BY EGYPTIAN DEL (WHICH ACTS IN GROUP AS UNOFFICIAL SPOKESMAN SUCH GOVTS), APPEARS TO BE ONE OF HARASSING NWS PARTY TO NPT, PLAYING ON AVERSION OF NES TO ALLEGATIONS THAT NWS ARE NOT LIVING UP TO THEIR ARTICLE FIVE UNDERTAKINGS, THEREBY SEEKING TO BRING PRESSURE ON NEWS TO DEVELOP PNES SO THAT INDIA WILL NEVER REMAIN AS ONLY POSSIBLE SUPPLIER UNDER ANY FUTURE REGIME. MOTIVATION OF AUSTRALIAN AND FRG DELS IS TO FAVOR INCLUSION IN ARRANGEMENTS OF INDIA AS SUPPLIER BECAUSE NPT DOES NOT SPECIFICALLY PROHIBIT THAT RESULT (IN THEIR VIEW) AND THESE DELS SAY THAT O DO OTHERWISE IN SUCH CIRCUMSTANCE WOULD BE AN UNWARRANTED EXTENSION OF LIMITATIONS VIS-A-VIS NNWS PARTY TO NPT.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 IAEA V 09489 01 OF 02 160136Z

H. RESPONSE TO QUESTION 3D REFTELA: NEGATIVE. HOWEVER, DEPARTMENT SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT IAEA GUIDELINES (IAEA DOC. INFCIRC/169) CITED PARA EIGHT, ANNEX TWO, THEMSELVES REFER THROUGHOUT TO THE "SUPPLIER NWS," BUT WITHOUT EXPLICIT REFERENCE TO NPT DEFINITION. REFERENCE IN UNGA DOCUMENT A/9722/ADD.1 TO DEFINITION OF SUPPLIER STATE WAS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED.

I. IN ANSWER TO QUESTIONS IN PARAS 10A, B, AND C OF REFTEL A, DEL PROVIDES THE FOLLOWING: WITH RESPECT TO PARTICIPATION: ARGENTINA, INDIA AND PAKISTAN HAVE NOT SPOKEN IN ANY PLENARY SESSIONS. OF THOSE THREE ONLY INDIA HAS PARTICIPATED SAYING ALMOST NOTHING) IN ANY MULTI-

DELEGATION INFORMAL DISCUSSION (ON QUESTION ADDRESSED PARA 3 REFTEL A) OF WHICH U.S. IS AWARE; MEXICO HAS MADE A FEW NON-SUBSTANTIVE INTERVENTIONS IN PLENARY BUT HAS OTHERWISE PLAYED ESSENTIALLY NO ROLE; USSR HAS SPOKEN OUT WITH STRONG STAND ON ONLY FEW ISSUES WHICH HAVE BEEN REPORTED BY DEL; FRG HAS INTRODUCED A NUMBER OF ISSUES WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN REPORTED;

AUSTRALIA, EGYPT AND UK, AND TO A SOMEWHAT LESSER  
EXTENT SWEDEN, HAVE BEEN PRINCIPAL ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS  
IN TERMS OF ATTEMPTS TO DEVELOP CONSENSUS FORMULATIONS  
AND OF INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FORMULATIONS  
(ESPECIALLY AUSTRALIA).

J.IN RESPONSE TO PARA 10B OF REFTEL A, THE MOST  
OBVIOUS PRESSURE DERIVES FROM CHAIRMAN WILSON'S  
ANNOUNCED SCHEDULE OF SUBMITTING GROUP'S REPORT FOR  
THE UNE 1977 BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND THEN TO 1977

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 IAEA V 09489 02 OF 02 160117Z

62

ACTION OES-06

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 IO-13 ISO-00 ACDA-07 CIAE-00 INR-07

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 NRC-05 DODE-00 FEA-01 OIC-02

AF-08 ARA-06 EA-07 NEA-10 USIE-00 PRS-01 NSCE-00

INRE-00 SSO-00 /101 W

----- 112156

O R 152009Z NOV 76

FM USMISSION IAEA VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC NIACT IMMEDIATE 8380

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USUN NEW YORK 3752

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USERDA HQ WASHDC

USERDA HQ GERMANTOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 IAEA VIENNA 9489

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (ADDITION OF MOSCOW AS INFO ADDEE)

DEPT PASS IO/SCT AND ACDA FOR MALONE, DAIVES

UNGA IN SOME MANNER. THIS HAS SO FAR NOT BEEN  
QUESTIONED BY ANY DEL AND ALL DELS WHO HAVE ACTUALLY  
PARTICIPATED IN PROCEEDINGS TO DATE SEEM TO BE  
SERIOUSLY WORKING TO MEET THIS SCHEDULE. SO FAR

OTHER DELS HAVE NOT OVERTLY PRESSED U.S. TO MOVE MORE RAPIDLY BUT THERE HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS STATEMENTS DURING THE NOVEMBER 12 AND 15 MEETINGS TO EFFECT THAT OTHER DELS WISHED TO KEEP MOMENTUM OF GROUP GOING. U.S. WOULD BE IN A BETTER POSITION IN THIS REGARD IF (A) U.S. DEL WERE AUTHORIZED TO DROP PROPOSED FORMULATIONS WHICH ARE UNACCEPTABLE TO OTHERS AND LEAVE DOCUMENT SILENT ON SUCH CONTROVERSIAL MATTERS IF NECESSARY IN VIEW OF CONSENSUS APPROACH OF GROUP DISCUSSED ABOVE, AND (B) U.S. DEL WERE AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT FORMULATIONS  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 IAEA V 09489 02 OF 02 160117Z

NON-PREJUDICIAL TO OUR POSITION WHEN AGREEMENT CANNOT BE REACHED ON OUR PREFERRED FORMULATIONS.

K. IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 10(C) DEL NOTES THAT MATTER OW WHICH AGREEMENT CANNOT BE REACHED CAN BE HANDLED IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS. DOCUMENTS GOV/COM.23/13 AND 14 CAN REMAIN SILENT ON THE MATTER ALTOGETHER; THE RELEVANT DOCUMENT CAN SIMPLY IDENTIFY THE MATTER AS ONE REQUIRING CONSIDERATION AT SOME LATER, AND UNSPECIFIED TIME; OR THE MATTER CAN BE ADDRESSED IN A GENERAL WAY THAT IS NON-PREJUDICIAL TO ANY EXPRESSED POSITION. BY THESE APPROACHES IT IS POSSIBLE, AND INDEED IS THE INTENTION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE GROUP, THAT THE REPORT OF THE GROUP GO FORWARD FOR THE JUNE BOARD. THE CONSEQUENCE OF THIS IS THAT FURTHER EFFORTS ON THESE AS WELL AS OTHER MATTERS WOULD BE REQUIRED AT A LATER

TIME IF THE EXERCISES OF ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL PNE SERVICE IS TO BE PURSUED AFTER THIS GROUP FULFILLS ITS TERMS OF REFERENCE.

L. WITH RESPECT TO PARA 6, REFTTEL A, RE RADIATION STANDARDS, THE USSR HAS SOUGHT TO INTRODUCE INTO THE REPORT OF THE GROUP A RECOMMENDATION TO EFFECT THAT RADIATION STANDARDS MUST BE DEVELOPED. THIS IS SUPPORTED BY GDR, HUNGARY AND PROBABLY OTHER BLOC STATES. THERE IS NOT OTHER STATED SUPPORT FOR THIS SPECIFIC POSITION AND AS INDICATED IN PARAS 4 AND 5 OF REFTTEL D, MOST OTHER ACTIVE DELS WILL SUPPORT U.S. DEL IN OPPOSING ANY SUCH RECOMMENDATION IN GROUP'S REPORT. THERE IS, HOWEVER, A GENERAL VIEW THAT IF THE AGENCY IS TO PERFORM HEALTH AND SAFETY ASSESSMENTS, SOME CRITERIA, STANDARDS OR GUIDELINES RELATING TO RADIATION AND SEISMIC EFFECTS WOULD BE NEEDED IN THE FUTURE. AT WHAT TIME IN THE FUTURE THESE STATES MIGHT SUPPORT WORK ON CRITERIA AND BY WHOM ARE QUESTIONS DEL CANNOT ANSWER WITHOUT FURTHER CONSULTATIONS. ACCORDINGLY, TENDENCY OF

AUSTRALIA AND OTHERS IN GROUP IS TO SEEK SOME  
FORMULATION WHICH MENTIONS STANDARDS OR CRITERIA  
IN EFFORT TO SATISFY USSR, WITHOUT INCORPORATING ANY  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 IAEA V 09489 02 OF 02 160117Z

COMMITMENT TO DEVELOP SAME.

6. IN RESPONSE TO PARA 7, REFTEL A, REGARDING ISSUE  
OF NO OBLIGATION TO DEVELOP PNE APPLICATIONS, MAIN  
OBJECTION SEEMS SIMPLY TO BE THE UNWILLINGNESS OF  
FRG AND EGYPT, AND NNWS IN GENERAL, TO ALLOW THE  
GROUP TO BE USED AS A VEHICLE FOR IN ANY WAY ENDORSING  
A REDUCTION OR A QUALIFICATION OF THE ARTICLE V  
OBLIGATIONS, WHETHER REAL OR APPARENT, OF NWS. THEY  
VIEW THE PROPOSED STATEMENT IN THIS LIGHT AND  
ACCORDINGLY HAVE REFUSED TO ENDORSE IT. WITH SPECIFIC  
REGARD TO USG POSITION THAT ARTICLE FIVE CARRIES  
NO SUCH OBLIGATION, EGYPTIAN DEL SAID PRIVATELY  
THAT HSI INTERPRETATION WAS CERTAINLY NOT MADE CLEAR  
WHEN NPT WAS NEGOTIATED AND THAT, ON CONTRARY, USG  
HAD AT THAT TIME STRESSED POTENTIAL BENEFITS AS  
INDUCEMENT OF NNWS TO PARTICIPATE IN NPT REGIME.  
THEREFORE, HE SAID, ALTHOUGH USG INTERPRETATION  
"MIGHT" BE CORRECT IN LAW, USG WOULD BE POLITICALLY  
DISINGENUOUS IF U.S. DEL ATTEMPTED TO PUT THIS  
INTERPRETATION ON GROUP RECORD AND HE WOULD BE  
OBLIGED TO OPPOSE IT AS STRONGLY AS POSSIBLE.

N. REGARDING PARA 4 OF REFTEL A ON DENIAL OF  
WEAPONS-RELATED BENEFITS TO SUPPLIER STATE, ON  
NOVEMBER 9, AS REPORTED REFTEL E, PARA 8, U.S.  
DEL PROPOSED NEW FORMULATION FOR GOV/COM.23/13,  
ANNEX II, PARAGRAPH I AS INSTRUCTED BY REFTEL C,  
PARA 6A. SWEDISH DEL THEN POINTED OUT THAT FORMULATION  
PROPOSED BY U.S. IMPLIED THAT EXISTING OBSERVATION  
PROCEDURES (INFCIRC/169) WERE INADEQUATE FOR THEIR  
INTENDED PURPOSE AND ASKED WHAT INFORMATION PRECLUDED  
BY NPT COULD BE OBTAINED BY RECIPIENT STATE UNDER  
EXISTING PROCEDURES. JAPANESE DEL QUESTIONED SUPPLIER  
STATE BEING ALLOWED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION  
HELPFUL TO ITS OWN WEAPONS ACTIVITIES WHEN PROVIDING  
SERVICE TO NNWS. U.S. DEL RESPONDED THAT IT IS NOT  
POSSIBLE TO DEVELOP PROCEDURES WHICH WOULD ACCOMPLISH  
WHAT EXISTING PARAGRAPH 8 OF GOV/COM.23/13, ANNEX II  
CALLS FOR WITH RESPECT TO PNE SUPPLIER STATES. IN  
RESPONSE TO SWEDISH INTERVENTION U.S. DEL SUGGESTED  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 IAEA V 09489 02 OF 02 160117Z

THAT THE SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 8 MIGHT BE SIMPLIFIED TO EFFECT THAT EXISTING PROCEEDURES SHOULD BE KEPT UNDER REVIEW TO ENSURE THEIR CONTINUED ADEQUACY WITHOUT REFERENCE TO SUPPLIER OR RECIPIENT. JAPANESE DEL THEN STATED THAT HE FELT THAT THERE SHOULD STILL BE SOME PRINCIPLE IN ANNEX II TO EFFECT THAT SUPPLIER STATES SHOULD NOT SEEK TO GAIN WEAPONS INFORMATION VIA SERVICE TO NNWS. SWEDISH DEL SUPPORTED JAPANESE AND ALSO SUGGESTED DROPPING WORD "FURTHER" FROM SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 8. AUSTRALIAN DEL SUPPORTED JAPAN AND SWEDEN. CHAIRMAN DEFERRED CONSIDERATION OF PARA 8 UNTIL LATER DURING CURRENT SESSION. THIS WAS THE EXTENT THROUGH NOV. 12 OF PLENARY DISCUSSION ON SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 8. AS REPORTED IN PARA 4E OF REFTEL B, JAPANESE IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION PRESENTED DRAFT PROPOSAL ALONG ABOVE LINES. JAPANESE HAVE SUBSEQUENTLY ON NOV. 15 INTRODUCED PROPOSAL INTO LIST OF CHANGES TO GOV/COM.23/13 TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN THAT DOCUMENT TAKEN UP AGAIN BY GROUP.

O. WITH RESPECT TO QUESTIONS 4A AND 4B OF REFTEL A, NO DEL HAS DISPUTED U.S. DEL STATEMENT THAT PROCEDURES CANNOT REPEAT NOT BE DEVELOPED WHICH WOULD ACCOMPLISH WHAT SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 8 SOUGHT WITH RESPECT TO SUPPLIER STATES. THERE HAS BEEN ON VIEW EXPRESSED BY ANY DEL AS TO WHETHER PROCEDURES DO OR DO NOT EXIST OR WOULD OR COULD BE DEVELOPED TO PREVENT A PNE SUPPLIER FROM GAINING NUCLEAR-WEAPONS-RELATED BENEFITS. JAPANESE PROPOSAL IS SIMPLE PROPOSAL THAT PNE SUPPLIER STATES "UNDERTAKE NOT TO SEEK" TO GAIN SUCH INFORMATION AND MAKES NO REFERENCE TO PROCEDURES OR TO QUESTION OF VERIFYING SUCH AN UNDERTAKING. JAPANESE, IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION, APPRECIATED THAT NWS WOULD, IN ALL LIKELIHOOD, UNAVOIDABLY GAIN SOME SUCH INFO AND STRESSED "NOT SEEK" POINT. AS NOTED ABOVE, STATE SUPPORT FOR JAPANESE PROPOSAL WAS VOICED BY SWEDEN AND AUSTRALIA. IN VIEW U.S. DEL JAPANESE PROPOSAL IF TABLED WOULD HAVE WIDE SUPPORT OF NNWS DELS BUT IN VIEW OF PARA 13 OF REFTEL A U.S. DEL HAS NOT SOUGHT VIEWS OF ANY OTHER DELS. THIS SUPPORT IN U.S. DEL'S VIEW WOULD BE MOTIVATED

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 IAEA V 09489 02 OF 02 160117Z

PRIMARILY BY DESIRE TO HAVE SIMILAR UNDERTAKINGS BY SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENT AND WOULD NOT DEPEND UPON FEASIBILITY OF VERIFYING COMPLIANCE BY SUPPLIER.

3. SEVERAL DELS (UK, USSR, JAPAN, EGYPT, AUSTRALIA,



INDIA) HAVE ALREADY PRIVATELY APPROACHED U.S. DEL TO SUGGEST THAT JANUARY 1977 MIGHT BE AN EQUALLY DIFFICULT TIME FOR USG TO TAKE BASIC DECISIONS OF POLICY ON ISSUES ARISING OUT OF GROUP'S DISCUSSIONS, WITH EGYPTIAN DEL WONDERING ALOUD IN PLENARY IF ALL DELS WOULD BE PREPARED AND INSTRUCTED TO "WORK HARD" ON ISSUES IN JANUARY. IN VIEW THIS SITUATION, U.S. DEL URGES DEPARTMENT NOT TO INSTRUCT U.S. DEL TO SUPPORT JANUARY SESSION OF GROUP UNLESS IT IS EXPECTED THAT USG REVIEW OF POLICH QUESTIONS INVOLVED THIS EXERCISE CAN BE EXPECTED TO RESULT IN INSTRUCTIONS TO U.S. DEL AT JANUARY GROUP SESSION PERMITTING FULL PARTICIPATION IN FORMULATION OF GROUP ADVICE TO BG ON AD REFERENDUM BASIS. WERE U.S. DEL AT JANUARY SESSION OF GROUP TO PROVE UANBLE TO PARTICIAPTE, USG WOULD LIKELY BECOME TARGET OF RECRIMINATIONS OF OTHER DELS AND RISK CONTINUING DISCUSSIONS OF GROUP WITHOUT USG PARTICIPATION.

4. ANSWERS TO REMAINING QUESTIONS REFTEL A IN PREPARATION AND WILL BE TRANSMITTED SEPTTEL PRIOR TO OPENING OF BUSINESS WASHINGTON 16 NOVEMBER.

5. U.S. DEL APPRECIATES CAREFUL ATTENTION DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN APYING TO THIS MATTER AND REGRETS DELAY IN RESPONDING TO ALL QUESTIONS REFTEL A, OCCASIONED BY ALL-DAY PLENARY SESSION OF GROUP 15 NOVEMBER. STONE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MEETING REPORTS, PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS, INFORMATION CONTROL, MEETINGS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 15 NOV 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** KelleyW0  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976IAEAV09489  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760450-0280, D760426-0429  
**From:** IAEA VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19761149/aaaabpuj.tel  
**Line Count:** 467  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION IO  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 9  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 76 STATE 280046, 76 IAEA VIENNA 9316, 76 STATE 273934, 76 IAEA VIENNA 9378, 76 IAEA VIENNA 9270  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** KelleyW0  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 12 NOV 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <12 NOV 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <16 AUG 2004 by KelleyW0>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** IAEA AD HOC ADVISORY GROUP ON PNES: RESPONSE TO USG REQUEST FOR INFORMATION  
**TAGS:** PARM, TECH, US, IAEA  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006